Published on 15th of each month.

Vol. VIII., No. 2. MAY, 1918.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

A Magazine to maintain the cause of TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS in the Church of England.

"By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance."—*Erasmus.*

"A State without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation."—*Edmund Burke.*

EDITOR: REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES—
- The Call to the English Clergy.
- The Policy of English Modernists.
- A not impossible Religion.
- An Imaginary Conversation.
- Reforms in the Orthodox Greek Churches.

ROMANISM, ANGLICANISM, AND PATRIOTISM.—By the EDITOR.

A JOINT CONFERENCE ON RE-UNION—
By Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D.

THE NEMESIS OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT—
By W. PROWER, M.A.

THE ASCENSION.—By Rev. Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

REVIEWS—
- An Oriental Theology.—By Principal F. B. Jevons, Litt.D.
- The Church in the Furnace.—By Professor Gardner, Litt.D., F.B.A.
- The Primitive Church.

BOOKS FOR THE CAMBRIDGE CONFERENCE.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

CORRESPONDENCE—
- Women Social Workers and the Clergy.
- An Illiberal Proposal.
- Crucifixes at Salisbury.

Printer and Publisher: WILLIAM PARR, Knaresborough.

London Agent:—ELLIOT STOCK, 7, Paternoster Row, E.C.

Price **6d.** net. Annual Subscription, **5/-** (including postage).

[ENTERED AT STATIONERS HALL.]

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President:—Professor GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.B.A., F.S.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

Sir C. THOMAS DYKE-ACLAND, Bart., Holnicote, Taunton, Somerset.
PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E., Harrogate.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq., 62, Fellows Road, N.W.
The Rev. Canon CHARLES, D.D., F.B.A., 4, Little Cloisters, Westminster Abbey.
The Rev. Canon CREMER, Seaford Vicarage, Sussex.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, Rest, Hodford Road, Golders Green, N.W.
The Rev Professor HENSLOW, Danehurst, Branksome Wood Road, Bournemouth.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE, Harvard University, U.S.A.
The Rev. W. MANNING, The Rectory, Chipping Barnet, Herts.
The Rev. Dr. MORRISON, The Rectory, Marylebone, W.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, Acrise, Hall Place Gardens, St. Albans.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon PLUMPTRE, St. James' Cathedral, Toronto.
Sir EDWARD RUSSELL, 5, Croxteth Road, Liverpool.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq., 1, Wellington Street, Strand, London, W.C.
The Rev. Dr. SYMONDS, Christ Church Cathedral, Montreal, Canada.

Members of the Council:

Rev. Canon GLAZEBROOK, The College, Ely (*Chairman*).

Mr. F. H. ANSON.
Prof. Sir W. J. ASHLEY.
Mr. P. H. BAGENAL.
Rev. Dr. CALDECOTT.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE.
Mr. F. C. CHANNING.
Rev. W. A. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG.
Rev. Canon CREMER.
Rev. J. A. DODD.
Rev. C. W. EMMET.
Rev. J, GAMBLE.
Miss ALICE GARDNER.
Mr. W. B. GORDON.
Rev. H. HANDLEY.
Mr. H. G. HART.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR.
Rev. W. MANNING.
The Hon. Mrs. MATHESON.
Rev. C. H. S. MATTHEWS.
Rev. J. L. MILNE.
Rev. Dr. MORRISON.
Dr. CYRIL NORWOOD.
Rev. Canon PAPILLON.
Mrs. REITH.
Rev. Dr. RENDALL.
Rev. Dr. H. G. ROSEDALE.
Rev. C. J. SHARP.
Rev. C. R. SHAW-STEWART.
Mr. NOWELL SMITH.
Rev. J. E. SYMES.
Rev. H. H. SYMONDS.
Rev. J. M. THOMPSON.
Rev. Dr. TOLLINTON.
Rev. FERGUS WOOD.

Hon. Treasurer:—Sir RICHARD STAPLEY, 33, Bloomsbury Square, W.C.
Hon. Auditor.—Mr. ROBERT WARNER, F.C.A., 10, Walbrook, E.C.
Hon. Secretary.—Rev. C. MOXON, 3, St. George's Square, London, S.W. 1.
Hon. Assistant Secretaries.—Miss. D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Mr. LLEWELYN PREECE, 8, Queen Anne's Gate, S.W.

OBJECTS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church to restate her belief from time to time as required by the progressive revelation of the Holy Spirit.
2.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness and corporate life of the Church of England, and her Christian spirit of tolerance in all things non-essential.
3.—To give all support in their power to those who are honestly and loyally endeavouring to vindicate the truths of Christianity by the light of scholarship and research; and while paying due regard to continuity, to work for such changes in the formularies and practices of the Church of England as from time to time are made necessary by the needs and knowledge of the day.
4.—To assert the rights and duties of the laity as constituent members of the Body of Christ
5.—To encourage friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

Annual Subscription:—Members at least 5/-; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. These should be paid to **Rev. C. Moxon,** 3, St. George's Square, London, S.W. 1.

"THE MODERN CHURCHMAN."

***The Modern Churchman*, the monthly organ of the Churchmen's Union, is sent *free* to all full members of the Union, and to non-members at a charge of 5/- per annum (postage paid).**

Editor:—Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Copgrove Rectory, Burton Leonard, Harrogate, to whom all literary contributions and books for review should be sent.

Business Manager:—Mrs. MAJOR, Copgrove Rectory, Burton Leonard, Harrogate, receives all subscriptions, advts., changes of address, &c., for the *Modern Churchman*.

From Mr. MURRAY'S Autumn Announcements.

The Modern Churchman's Library.

Edited by the Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Editor of the *Modern Churchman*. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net volume. In Paper Covers. 1s. 6d. net each.

"The Modern Churchman's Library" is an effort to meet the need for clear, short, truthful books dealing with the Christian religion from the standpoint of those who, while accepting the main results of modern scientific, historical and literary research, are yet believers in the Christian religion and working members of the Church of England.

I. THE FAITH OF A MODERN CHURCHMAN.
By the Rev. Canon M. G. GLAZEBROOK, D.D. (sometime Headmaster of Clifton College). Crown 8vo. (*Just published*).

II. THE GENIUS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.
By the Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., Vicar of Ashby St. Ledgers. Crown 8vo. (*Already published*).

III. THE EVOLUTION OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.
By the Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A. (sometime Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford). (*In the press*).

IV. BAPTISM, CONFIRMATION AND THE EUCHARIST.
By the Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B.D., Vicar of St. Mary's, Leigh Woods. (*To be published later*).

"There is an interest attaching to the volume for the daring manifest throughout its pages."—*The Globe.*

THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST,

AN ESSAY IN INTERPRETATION,

BY THE

Rev. S. P. T. PRIDEAUX, D.D.,

Author of *The Cradle of Christianity.*

The difficulties of the Apocalyptic element in the Gospels have long been a sore puzzle to many, and much light has recently been thrown upon its inner meaning and its perennial value by the world-catastrophe of the war. The writer has here attempted to offer a solution for the one, and an interpretation of the other, hoping that both will be acceptable to thinking men and women of the present age who long for light and direction in its mazes and perplexities.

In crown 8vo, cloth gilt, 173 pp., 3s. net.

OF ALL BOOKSELLERS.

SIR ISAAC PITMAN & SONS, Ltd., 1, AMEN CORNER, LONDON, E.C. 4.

PAGE

Signs of the Times—
The Call to the English Clergy 49
The Policy of English Modernists 51
A not impossible Religion 52
An Imaginary Conversation 54
Reforms in the Orthodox Greek Churches 56
Romanism, Anglicanism, and Patriotism 58
A Joint Conference on Re-union 62
The Nemesis of the Oxford Movement 67
The Ascension 71
Reviews—An Oriental Theology 79
The Church in the Furnace 84
The Primitive Church... 87
Books for the Cambridge Conference 91
Churchmen's Union News... 93
Correspondence—Women Social Workers and the Clergy 95
An Illiberal Proposal 95
Crucifixes at Salisbury 96

CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

THE LONDON GATHERING.

ANNUAL SERVICE AND MEETINGS,
Thursday, June 27th, 1918.

12-0 **Holy Communion** in Christ Church, Westminster (by kind permission of the Vicar). Preacher: The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF CARLISLE.

3 p.m. The **Annual General Meeting of Members** in Caxton Hall, Westminster. 5 p.m., **Tea.**

5-30 p.m. **Public Meeting** in Caxton Hall.
Speakers and Subjects:
Dr. MACAN, Master of University College, Oxford.
The Liberty of Prophesying.
Rev. HAROLD ANSON, M.A.
Liberal Theology for the Working Man.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.
The Interchange of Pulpits.

PRIEST, young, married, experienced, desires curacy or charge. Liberal; preach, intone. Reasonable stipend. Free immediately. Apply to "X," Copgrove Rectory, Burton Leonard, Harrogate.

PRELIMINARY

Fifth Conference of Modern Churchmen

CAMBRIDGE

August 5——12, 1918

Conference Committee—

Professor Percy Gardner, Litt.D., F.B.A.

P. H. Bagenal, O.B.E.
The Dean of Carlisle
Rev. Cyril Emmet, B.D.
Rev. J. Gamble, B.D.
Rev. Canon Glazebrook, D.D.
Rev. H. D. A. Major, B.D.
Mrs. Major
Rev. C. Moxon, M.A.
Mrs. Moxon
Miss D. Nussey
Mrs. Reith

The Conference this year will be held at Cambridge, where by the kindness of the authorities, Girton College has again been placed at the disposal of the Committee.

The Conference will begin on *Monday afternoon, Aug. 5th*, and will close on *Monday morning, Aug. 12th*. The programme proper will end on *Saturday, the 10th*, but it is thought that two extra days would be appreciated by those able to afford the time.

The charge for tickets will be advertised later.

The general subject will be *The Psychology of Religious Experience*, and the Conference will be opened by a presidential address on The Psychological Basis of Religion. The subjects chosen for the morning sessions are :—The Psychology of Sin, of Repentance and Forgiveness, of Conversion and Saintliness, the Practice of Devotion and its Psychological Value, the Psychology of Public Worship and Christian Fellowship. The subjects for the evening sessions are :—The Validity of the Argument from Religious Experience, the Psychology of Inspiration, the Religious Experience of Youth and Age, the Psychology of the Christian Motive, the Witness of the Heart to Christ. At Evensong addresses will be given on (among others) Clement of Alexandria, Thomas à Kempis, Pascal, Carlyle, treated as types of the religious life.

The following have already promised to read papers :—The Dean of Carlisle, Prof. A. A. Cock, Rev. Principal Dewick, Miss Dougall, Rev. C. W. Emmet, Prof. Gardner, Mrs. C. W. Graham, Prof. Granger, Prof. Jevons, Rev. C. Moxon, Rev. W. C. Roberts, Mr. K. Saunders, Dr. F. R. Tennant, Rev. E. Milner White.

Addresses in chapel will be given by Rev. A. Fawkes, Miss Alice Gardner, Rev. H. Handley, Mr. A. H. Peppin, Mr. Nowell Smith, Dr. Tollinton, and others.

The Conference will be open to members of the Churchmen's Union, and to those who are in sympathy with its principles and objects.

Hon. Secretary—Dora Nussey, Westfield, Ilkley.
Hon. Press Secretary—P. H. Bagenal, Harrogate.

HEMSLEY & SONS, PRINTERS, ILKLEY.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

No. 2. MAY, 1918. Vol. VIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

The Call to the English Clergy.

If at the outbreak of the War our English bishops took the wrong turning with the best intentions in regard to clerical combatants, they have nobly atoned for their mistake, if such it was, by their recent action in connection with "the cutting out" of the clergy from the latest Man Power Bill. Their prompt and public declaration, that it was no pressure on their part which induced the Government "to cut out" the clergy, has immediately killed a number of unpleasant rumours as detrimental to the influence of the Church as they are painful to the patriotic feelings of the clergy.

It is now perfectly clear that neither the English bishops nor the English clergy had anything to do with the Government's action, which would appear to have been prompted by consideration for the Roman Catholic priesthood, who, although members of that body are serving as combatants in France and Italy, are yet forbidden by Canon Law to bear arms and shed blood.

The prompt disavowal by the English bishops has been rendered all the more impressive by their subsequent action in inviting all their clergy who are under 51 years of age to volunteer at once for War service. We are sure that the vast majority of the clergy will respond readily, for, although conscious of the claims of their sacred calling and of the

special duties which it involves, they have also felt for some time past not only that their exclusion has placed them in an invidious position—this could have been borne with Christian fortitude—but that the policy has been detrimental to the influence of their message, which is a much more serious matter.

The question which will now exercise the minds of many of the clergy is this: Ought I to volunteer for combatant service? Already a considerable number of clergymen have fallen as combatants, but many of their brethren may feel that although the patriotism of these brave men was beyond praise, their conception of their ministerial vocation was defective. We venture to suggest that a deeper and more reflective view of that vocation will not readily assent to this conclusion. The object of a clergyman's life is to exercise moral and spiritual influence, to be, to use a common clerical phrase, "a means of grace" to his fellow-men. At first sight it seems that this moral and spiritual influence can be most effectively exercised in a chaplain's position, but the lesson of the Cross suggests that the strait path of hardship and suffering, trodden in real fellowship with humanity, may produce moral and spiritual results, which the exercise of normal priestly functions cannot, in many cases, effect. That is why, we suppose, the Christ was a crucified carpenter and not the High Priest of Israel. This consideration at least suggests that where a clergyman cannot serve as a chaplain, he will do well to select combatant service in preference to non-combatant service, for combatant service means more perfect fellowship with our countrymen in danger and death than does work in a Y.M.C.A. or Church Army Hut. It presents a greater prospect of offering the supreme sacrament.

We honour the soldier, as Ruskin reminds us, not because he takes life, but because he is willing to give life, even his own, for his country. For the same reason the nation may well honour the priest, and the priest if he die as a combatant,

will, if it be with pure devotion to the good of humanity, be following in the footsteps of Him, who said:—

"My life, no man taketh it from Me. I lay it down of Myself. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

The Policy of English Modernists.

Mrs. Humphry Ward's recollections, which have been appearing for several months past in the *Cornhill*, throw many interesting side-lights on the struggles of Victorian Liberal Churchmanship.

In the April number she tells the story of the event which led her to write *Robert Elsmere*. She heard in St. Mary's, in 1881, an Oxford University sermon delivered by the Rev. John Wordsworth (afterwards Bishop of Salisbury) dealing with unsettlement in religion.

"It was the shock of indignation excited in me by the sermon which led directly—though after seven years—to write *Robert Elsmere*.

"The sermon was on 'the present unsettlement in religion,' and it connected the 'unsettlement' definitely with 'sin.' The 'moral causes of unbelief,' said the preacher, 'were (1) prejudice; (2) severe claims of religion; (3) intellectual faults, especially indolence, coldness, recklessness, pride, and avarice.'

"The sermon expounded and developed this outline with great vigour, and every sceptical head received its due buffeting in a tone and fashion that now scarcely survives. I sat in the darkness under the gallery; the preacher's fine ascetic face was plainly visible in the middle light of the church; and while the confident, priestly voice flowed on, I seemed to see, grouped around the speaker, the forms of those, his colleagues and contemporaries, the patient scholars and thinkers of the Liberal host, Stanley, Jowett, Green of Balliol, Lewis Nettleship, Henry Sidgwick, my uncle, whom he in truth—though perhaps not consciously—was attacking. My heart was hot within me. How could one show England what was really going on in her midst? Surely the only way was through imagination; through a picture of actual life and conduct; through something as 'simple, sensuous, passionate,' as one could make it. Who and what were the persons of whom the preacher gave this grotesque account? What was their history? How had their thoughts and doubts come to be? What was the effect of them on conduct?"

In the May *Cornhill* Mrs. Ward tells the story of the reception of *Robert Elsmere*. What is of particular interest

here is her reference to the attitude of Matthew Arnold to the line she makes her hero take. She believes that he would not have sympathised with it, and she confesses that she has, somewhat sadly and slowly, as *Richard Meynell* indicates, come round to her uncle's way of thinking.

> "My uncle was a Modernist long before the time. In *Literature and Dogma* he threw out in detail much of the argument suggested in *Robert Elsmere*, but to the end of his life he was a contented member of the Anglican Church so far as attendance at her services was concerned, and belief in her mission of 'edification' to the English people. He had little sympathy with people who 'went out.' Like Mr. Jowett, he would have liked to see the Church slowly reformed and 'modernised' from within. So that with the main theme of my book—that a priest who doubts must depart—he could never have had full sympathy. And in the course of years—as I showed in a later novel written twenty-four years after *Robert Elsmere*—I feel that I have very much come to agree with him! These great national structures that we call churches are too precious for iconoclast handling, if any other method is possible. The strong assertion of individual liberty within them, as opposed to the attempt to break them down from without,—that seems to me now the hopeful course. A few more heresy trials like those which sprang out of *Essays and Reviews* or the persecution of Bishop Colenso would let in fresh life and healing nowadays, as did those old stirrings of the waters. The first Modernist bishop who stays in his place, forms a Modernist chapter and diocese around him, and fights the fight where he stands, will do more for liberty and faith in the Church, I now sadly believe, than those scores of brave 'forgotten dead,' who have gone out of her for conscience sake, all these years."

If Mrs. Humphry Ward is right, the practical question for Modernists seems to be: when ought we to have the next heresy trial, and who ought to be tried?

A Not Impossible Religion.

Professor Silvanus Thompson, D.Sc., F.R.S., honourably known in the world of physical science, left, when he died in June, 1916, an almost completed volume in which his editor tells us:

> "He wished to set forth his own vision of a simple spiritual Christianity, in no wise in conflict with the discoveries of research or the attitude of science, a living, practical religion which would meet the deepest need of others, as it had done of his own life."

The book, which merits its title, *A Not Impossible Religion*,* merits also the attention of our readers. It builds a bridge between traditionalism and modernism. It presents a faith which is as far removed from "cheap and flippant unbelief" as from "earnest credulity." We might cite a hundred passages, but have limited ourselves to four, which present in vigorous and uncompromising language the ideals for which the *Modern Churchman* has contended for the last seven years, but in more measured terms.

The Christian test ought not to be a dogmatic test, but one of devotion to Christ, based, so Dr. Silvanus Thompson holds, on *intuition.*

> "Bethink you! What was Christ's own test which He put to the man, who, in spite of the intuition of Caesarea Philippi, had fallen away grievously in the hour of trial?
>
> *Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me?*
> Not—dost thou believe in the dogmas of the Church?
> Not—dost thou believe in Original Sin?
> Not—dost thou believe in the Doctrine of the Atonement by Blood?
> Not—dost thou believe in the Virgin Birth?
> Not—dost thou believe in an Eternal Hell of Fire?
> Not any of these, but just this—*Lovest thou Me?*
>
> Would that we might all, with equal power of conviction and sincerity, be able to respond, Lord, Thou knowest all things: Thou knowest that I love thee." (pp. 291-2).

The faith which Christ Himself taught, rather than what His followers have taught about Christ, Dr. Silvanus Thompson urges, should be the faith of the Christian disciple.

> "From all such vain word-battlings and their sonorous symbols, from the *homoousions* and *filioques* of embittered partizans, from the unedifying quarrels of Arian and Athanasian, of Sabellian and Augustinian, of Calvinist and Socinian, of Trinitarian and Unitarian, let us return to the simplicity of Christ's own creed: *It is enough for the disciple that he be as his Master.*" (p. 261).

Dr. Silvanus Thompson makes a number of references to that much-debated theme the Virgin birth. He writes:—

> "The Church cannot, even if it would, erase from its own Bibles the words of Peter in his first sermon in Jerusalem, words which both as

* Published by John Lane, The Bodley Head, London; price 6/- net (1918).

spoken, and as recorded, antedate not only every Council or Synod of the Church, but also all of the Gospels, and are a thousandfold weightier authority than any subsequent pronouncement could be: 'the patriarch David . . . being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that *of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh*, He would raise up Christ.' (Acts ii. 29-30). If this is not a definite statement by Peter that Christ was the son of David by human descent—according to the flesh,—then words have no meaning, whatever. And the genealogy given by Luke (iii. 23) and the genealogy given by Matthew (i. 16), in which the lineal descendant of David, Joseph, is set down as the father of Jesus, are, if they do not mean the same thing, absolutely gratuitous and irrelevant. . . . . The uninstructed non-scientific anthropomorphism which could only conceive of one wholly human yet also Divine by imagining, in the fashion of the pagan mythologies, a being having one human parent and one Divine parent, has left us a conception that ends by making Jesus only half-man, and therefore only half-God. . . . We have got to clear our minds of these materialistic, these non-scientific, these atheistical conceptions, and return to the infinite truth that God is Spirit. . . . Let us boldly claim that Jesus was not half, nor one-quarter, but wholly human, and that in a far higher sense than any materialising Church dogma or tradition can pretend, He was also wholly Divine." (pp. 145-51).

The Professor is equally clear and strong in regard to a great deal of current traditional sacramental teaching. He writes:—

"Nine-tenths of what has lately been written in the public press upon what is called 'the reservation of the blessed sacrament' is due to a materialism from which the whole spirit of the teaching of Jesus has utterly vanished. Modern chemistry has had this salutary effect that it has rendered it for ever impossible for any educated person to believe in either transubstantiation or in consubstantiation as a fact. . . . But the spirit that even in the days of the disciples closed their eyes and ears, and made them slow of heart to perceive the spiritual significance of things, and led them to take grosser and more material views, still dominates the ecclesiastical world." (p. 126).

An Imaginary Conversation.

Lord Hugh Cecil's resolution recently proposed in the Canterbury House of Laymen:—

"To secure that no person should be made a deacon, ordained a priest, or consecrated a bishop in the Church of England who does not thoroughly hold, and will not faithfully teach, the truth of the Church's teaching in regard to the Nativity of our Lord"—

has attracted the notice of Mr. F. J. Gould in the April *Literary Guide*. Lord Hugh managed to carry his resolution by 15 to 9, mainly, it would appear, by means of the argument that "a line must be drawn somewhere." Mr. Gould imagines, however, that had Lord Hugh had the privilege of addressing five New Testament writers (whom with a certain latitude he calls Apostles) he would have failed to secure their support for his resolution.

The following imaginary conversation presents in a brief and simple form one of the main difficulties which confronts those Churchmen who insist on the literal acceptance of the Virgin Birth as a historical fact:—

Lord Hugh Cecil. Peace be unto you, most noble witnesses to the Faith once delivered unto the saints!

Apostles. We salute you as a man—so we have heard—eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures.

L.H.C. It has occurred to me that I ought to draw your benign attention to recent occurrences which have caused the Church to rock and shake. A certain man has, I regret to say, been consecrated Bishop of Hereford, though he is suspected of not believing, literally and legally, in the Virgin Birth of Our Lord. Some things, reverend fathers, are matters of individual opinion and selection, and one may pardon discrepancies in narrative or doctrine——

Apostles. We appreciate your lordship's tact.

L.H.C. But one must draw the line somewhere. I regret to inform you that in the English House of Laymen nine men voted in opposition to my motion affirming the vital importance of the Nativity article; though, on my own side, fifteen loyally rallied. It is a comfort to me to meet authorities, like yourselves, who have first-hand data. You, for example, illustrious physician——

Luke. Pardon, not first-hand data in my case. As I told my correspondent Theophilus, the story in my Gospel, including the Virgin Birth, merely sets forth things "most surely believed among us."

L.H.C. I thank you; and Father Matthew?

Matthew. My narrative of the Virgin Birth is before your lordship. "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ"—that is perfectly clear. And my account was documented with a prefatory pedigree, beginning with Abraham. Your lordship understands the value of extremely old records . . .

L.H.C. Quite! I love antiquities. And you other three reverend doctors of the Faith will, it goes without saying, support the . . .

Mark. Well, I must remind you that I did not deem the topic worth any allusion. One must draw the line somewhere.

L.H.C. Surely you are mistaken!

Mark. Kindly consult your Greek Testament.

L.H.C. (*after searching the Second Gospel*). There is, indeed, a grave omission, which surprises and grieves me; the Virgin Birth is not mentioned. By the way, your Greek is not up to the Oxford standard.

Mark. Your lordship must accept my apologies.

L.H.C. But *your* Greek, Saint John, if you will allow me to say so, is comparatively elegant.

John. English aristocrats are very affable. But with respect to our special subject, I have to point out to you that I regarded the Virgin Birth as beneath notice.

L.H.C. Sir!

John. In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God; and what you call the Nativity was too materialistic an episode for my Platonic Evangel.

L.H.C. And you, too, John! . . .

Paul. My dear Cecil, it distresses us mutually to prolong this interview. Let me say, quite curtly, that, though I issued many epistles, I did not reckon the doctrine you champion as deserving any extended treatment, nor any treatment at all.

L.H.C. Perhaps, reverend fathers, Paul is right. I had hoped to secure a unanimous vote, but on the present occasion I . . .

Reforms in the Orthodox Greek Churches.

The *Challenge* of April 19th published a significant sermon, delivered in the cathedral of Athens on March 21st, by the new metropolitan, His Holiness Meletios Metaxakis. The sermon naturally breathed deep patriotic feeling, but this was linked with the ideal of Church reform, and Church reform having its foundation and security in a thoroughly educated clergy. His Holiness is reported as saying:—

"I believe in the Lord Jesus, that we find ourselves at the dawn of a new ecclesiastical life worthy of our past, and worthy of the new horizons to which we look as the fruit of our present struggles. . ."

"I desire a thoroughly educated clergy. I desire our full Church regeneration. Let us co-operate, all of us—pastors, governors, legislators, people—that the reproach of lack of education may be removed from the Greek clergy. . . But in seeking education for the sacred clergy I am not indifferent to the quality of this education, understanding very well that one education differs from another, and one culture from another. The Orthodox Church, standing as it does, from a dogmatic point of view, between two extremes, Protestant

anarchy and Catholic absolutism, wishes the culture and its clergy also to lie between two extremes, wisely uniting the free activity of the spirit with the traditional adherence to formulated dogma, according to the best examples of the great Greek teachers of the Church, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, Chrysostom."

This sounds very hopeful, and as the reforms proposed are of a strictly conservative and educational type, they ought to be easily practicable.

The sister Church of Russia is apparently engaged in carrying out reforms with an almost breathless rapidity to judge from an interesting article by the Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton, which appeared recently in the *English Church Review.*

The Imperial Procurator of the Holy Synod has naturally been abolished. The Orthodox Church is still, however, to be the State Church, but all other denominations have been freed from disabilities. The Bishops are to be elected by their Diocesan Synods, and parish priests by their parochial councils. The bishop may veto twice, but must accept the third nominee of the parochial council. Considerable reforms have been made in the monasteries and nunneries, the active life of good works receiving more encouragement than heretofore.

In the Spiritual Academies, which admit University graduates for the priesthood, there is to be freedom of teaching, not under the domination of the bishops. The course is to be from three to seven years, the students are to have the right to arrange courses of lectures for themselves. This, however, was before the Bolshevist ascendancy; we do not know what has happened since. It is probable that by now the students have authority to arrange lectures for their tutors, and to insist on their compulsory attendance.

ROMANISM, ANGLICANISM, AND PATRIOTISM.

By the Editor.

Since 1588, when Lord Howard of Effiingham commanded the English fleet which defeated the Spanish Armada, the English Roman Catholic nobility and gentry have, as a body, been loyal to the English crown and cause. For the first two centuries after the Armada, loyalty was no easy matter for them. For nearly a hundred years after that event any Roman priest caught in England was hanged, drawn and quartered, as a traitor. For nearly two hundred years after it, the Popish recusants were compelled to attend their parish churches under penalty of a fine, which was distributed to the poor of the parish. Yet the English Roman Catholic laity remained loyal to England. It is not therefore surprising that modern English Roman Catholics, who enjoy complete religious and political freedom, should resent the imputation that they have any sympathy with the Roman hierarchy in Ireland which has encouraged organized opposition to conscription in that country. The fact that the *Times*, in a leading article, attributed the action of the Irish bishops to the sinister influence of the Vatican, has made the position of English Romanists even more painful. It is true that Roman dignitaries in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, have not been ardent supporters of the British Empire in its life and death struggle, but it would be hard to prove that this is due to any direct action on the part of the Vatican. Direct action is as dangerous as it is unnecessary. The Irish Roman Catholic element throughout the Empire has long been hostile to the Empire, and of late the French Canadian element has become so. This is mainly due to the narrow provincialism of these nationalities, which their Romanism has preserved and even fostered. They are ecclesiastical and educational back-waters in the great stream of the Empire's life, sedulously

preserving a memory for past wrongs with a heart untouched by gratitude for present benefits.

But in this matter of loyalty to the Empire a clear distinction should be drawn between the priest and the layman. The Roman layman, when he is an Englishman, is loyal to the British Empire, but this does not follow in the case of the Roman priest. Father Bernard Vaughan is a *rara avis*. The Roman ecclesiastic is not interested in the British Empire. "He is not a British imperialist," it will be said, "because he is an internationalist." But this is not the case. He is an imperialist of another breed. He does not love all nations, he only loves the Roman Catholics in each nation. The number of Roman Catholics in the British Empire is small: the number outside is large; hence the interests of the Roman ecclesiastic lie largely outside the British Empire. Moreover, the ideals of our Empire, educational, social, political, are not his ideals. His ideals in these matters are mainly inherited from the Roman Empire and the mediaeval Church, and however excellent they may be, they are not British. Hence he is at heart an alien. He is living *in partibus infidelium*. He is here to convert, not to love and to foster. It is not therefore altogether just to blame the Roman ecclesiastic simply because he is not a loyal supporter of the British Empire in its present struggle for existence. He may be blamed that he is a neutral in this life and death fight for freedom, righteousness, and humanity, but that is another question; it is not one of patriotism and loyalty, but of morals.

The case of the English Church is exactly the reverse. There is an inborn sympathy between her and England. In a sense she is more English than England—as an acute American writer observed a few years ago—at least than the cosmopolitan England of the days before the war. Throughout our wide dominions she is not the least powerful of the links between the younger communities and the Homeland. The following quotation from an address delivered by a

seasoned Anglo-Indian layman in the American Church at Kodaikanal, Madras, June 24, 1917, expresses a feeling towards the English Church which is as deep as it is discerning:—

> "The Church of England, what shall I say of her, my own Church? I forget what cynic it was that said of her that her mission was to prevent men becoming too religious. It is true that she has ever been a Church of respectability, of half-truths, of compromise, of gentlemanly reticence and decorum. She has never been the champion of any great righteous cause; nor ever given cause for scandal. But there is another side to the picture. Have you ever stood in a quiet English country lane on a Sunday evening and heard the distant bell summoning the worshippers of God? You have felt something then of the deep and calm beauty of English religious life for which her Church stands. Have you ever seen young men—lay and cleric—young 'varsity men with the world at their feet—giving their lives in the dismal slums of a great city? You know something then of the sense of duty inspired by the religion of the Church of England. The Church of England has been made by English men and itself has moulded English character. It has been for centuries a strong purifying and uplifting but eminently conservative element in English life, and perhaps that is the very reason why we cannot expect such a Church to have any clarion message at this time of crisis. She is too peculiarly English and insular to be all at once the prophet of a new age. But even the Church of England has been stirred by the upheaval of the world."[1]

A very similar description of Anglicanism comes from quite another quarter—the autobiography of a recent convert to Rome. He writes:—

> "Anglicanism, generally speaking, is not a system of religion nor a body of truth, but a feeling, a tradition, its roots intertwined with associations of national and of family life; you do not learn it, you grow into it."[2]

Her historic shrines of Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's Cathedral have an imperial as well as an ecclesiastical significance, and the former overshadows the latter.

What is true of the English Church is true of the English clergyman, unles he be enervated by an ultramontanism which makes him speak of Anglicanism as "a white cliffs of Dover religion," or is bemused by an impossible internationalism which links him more closely to German social-democrats or Russian Bolsheviks than to his own countrymen.

[1] "The Church as seen by a Layman," by Arthur Davies in *The Harvest Field*, vol. 37, p. 286.
[2] R. Knox. *A Spiritual Aeneid*, p. 20.

The English clergyman is a patriot in his religion. That does not mean that he does not recognise that the Anglican Church has an obligation to all mankind, but it does make him feel that its obvious and primal duty is to the British Empire. It was the Apostle of the Gentiles, himself a Jew, who uttered and acted on the rule "To the Jew first" in his great work of winning the Roman Empire for Christ, and it was a greater than St. Paul, who said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel."

The English clergyman labours to make the English Church the moral and spiritual inspirer of the British Empire, and the Empire a more effective agent in advancing the Kingdom of God. The English clergyman does not speak contemptuously of English patriotism, he strives to inspire it with the loftiest ideals. He does not desire to abolish British imperialism, but to perfect it.

Our race has not been faultless, but it has furnished noble examples of chivalry and generosity. Our Empire has a dark side, but of all the empires of the earth, its policy has been marked by a sense of justice, humanity, and freedom to which no other has as yet attained. Our past is no mean and insecure foundation on which to build a greater and more glorious future. Thus the English clergyman will naturally use the spiritual and moral treasures of the British race to win even greater treasures for it, and through it for all mankind. Consequenly his method will differ widely from that of the Roman priest in the British Empire. The Roman pervert already quoted, writes of that English epic, *Westward Ho*:—

> "Nothing else binds up quite so successfully England's greatness with her loss of the Catholic Faith."

His remark is true of *Westward Ho*, and although he would not assent to it, it is also true historically. The Reformation which gave to us our National Church, gave to us also the fulness of national life. "The spacious times of great Elizabeth" would have been impossible in a Romanist

England. If we doubt it, let us compare Scotland and Ireland. Scotland owes her influential position in the British Empire to John Knox. Roman Catholic Ireland owes her anomalous and unenviable position in that Empire to-day to the mournful fact that the Reformation which won the settlers of the Pale never won her native race. We do not blame the Irish race for this; history teaches tolerance and even compassion, but the real reason why that race does not share to-day in the Empire's humane and heroic cause is because it has clung to Romanism, and this has made native Ireland ever ready in every crisis of the sister isle to throw herself into the arms of Spaniards, Frenchmen, Americans, Germans, providing only they were hostile to England. Religion is the great uniter, as it is the great divider of men.

A JOINT CONFERENCE ON RE-UNION.

By Rev. C. W. Emmet, B.D., Vicar of West Hendred.

A joint Conference of the Anglican and Free Church Fellowships has recently been held, of which the subject was Re-union. It is not the first time these bodies have met together, and the experience of earlier Conferences on more neutral subjects had shown that the way was prepared for a Conference at which the crucial subjects might be frankly faced. The object of this account is not to give any detailed report, but to record the impressions left on the mind of the writer. No formal resolutions were in fact presented to the Conference, though certain general points of agreement were formulated and accepted. It should also be made quite clear that, though the gathering was open to all members of the Fellowships, the attendance was necessarily limited (between fifty and sixty were present), and neither of the Fellowships is,

at present at least, in any way committed even to these tentative results, still less to any impressions formed by individuals, such as the present writer, as to the trend of opinion. It was in particular a matter of regret that the strict High Church position was not more fully represented. It was ably stated in a more or less modified, not to say liberal, form by one or two members, but it was felt that there was room for a more uncompromising exposition of it. Certainly there was no desire on the part of any to burk this side, but its absence must be borne in mind in estimating the significance of the apparent agreement on certain questions.

The first point to which attention must be directed is the general spirit of the Conference. Unquestionably the depth and reality of spiritual unity and fellowship achieved at such gatherings would be a revelation to many, and would indeed revolutionise their whole attitude with regard to the problem of the recognition of other Churches. No one ever dreamt of attempting to score a point at the expense of an opponent, still less to make a proselyte. The one desire on both sides was that the varying points of view should be frankly and intelligently stated in such a way that we might understand and appreciate real difficulties where they existed, and, still more, discover the fundamental agreements which often lie behind the variety and apparent contradictions of language. It was not merely that we learned to respect one another's sincerity and principles, which is often supposed to be the furthest we can get on such occasions, but we discovered more and more clearly that the points on which we differed were in certain cases not principles at all, but lay only on the periphera of the Christian life.

The subjects discussed covered the respective merits of confederation and re-union, the nature of the Sacraments and the Ministry, the opposing ideals of an inclusive or strict and limited Church, and various practical methods of immediate co-operation and fellowship. On what may be called the

theological and ecclesiastical questions there was a considerable measure of agreement, and it was felt that the consideration of such official and technical points must proceed, as for instance in the "Faith and Order" Committees. But it was also felt, and the feeling was formulated in the summary presented at the final meeting, that the first and far the most hopeful step for the immediate future lies in *the determination to achieve as much local unity as possible.* We were told that there were many, especially of those who had passed through the ranks of the Student Christian Movement, who cannot find their spiritual home in any one of the organised Churches. They desire a fuller and more comprehensive fellowship at once, such as they have found in this movement. Hence the Conference was urged to develop local experiments on inter-denominational lines, and to organise gatherings for common action in such tasks as presented themselves. What was advocated went a good deal further than the well-worn plan of being content with a strictly limited co-operation on more or less neutral questions such as purity or temperance. The idea was not to unite on the social platform as opposed to the religious, but to make local efforts on religious lines without waiting for the necessarily slow and cautious official action of the central authorities. This is a policy in which readers of the *Modern Churchman* will be ready to take their full share at once.

The basis is the essential identity of religious experience felt at all gatherings at which members of different Churches come together with a sincere desire to realise their fellowship in the One Body. This fellowship ceases at once to be a matter for argument; it is there; we find it beyond all question and cavil, and discussions as to covenanted and uncovenanted mercies, validity of Orders, or recognition of separated bodies as Churches, become, if not irrelevant, at least subordinate. This may be illustrated from the common conclusions formulated with regard to the Sacraments—

1.—In view of the ambiguities associated with the word "grace" in this connexion, we agree that it is best to regard "grace" as equivalent to the presence and work of the Holy Spirit.

2.—Having met together on the ground of a common religious experience, both Anglican and Freechurchmen have discovered that their community of religious experience extends into the sacramental sphere: that both regard sacraments as an integral element in the upbuilding of their spiritual life, and are thankful that the Churches to which they belong have maintained the practice of the Sacraments of the Gospel.

3.—Though they interpret it in various ways, they both recognise that the Sacrament of the Holy Communion is normally the supreme opportunity for receiving and expressing communion with Christ crucified and living, and with their fellow-members in Christ. In this Ordinance our redemption by Christ and union with Him as our Life are brought within our reach, for fresh appropriation by faith, in a way which emphasises peculiarly the Divine initiative.

4.—Both feel strongly the social nature of this Ordinance as implying and strengthening the Fellowship of members of the Body of Christ, and agree that we have not been sufficiently alive to this in our thought and practice.

5.—In consequence of this measure of common experience and belief, we feel increasing dissatisfaction with the partial measure of Fellowship in Sacramental Communion at present available in our respective denominations, whereby the value to each of our separate sacraments is not as rich and full as it would otherwise be. We, therefore, feel also increasingly the obligation to do everything in our power to overcome the existing hindrances to intercommunion.

It may be added that, following the rule established for the Anglican Fellowship, members of the Conference were present without communicating at the celebrations of the Churches of which they were not members, but there was certainly a large number of Anglicans who, except for their desire to be loyal to this understanding, would have communicated without hesitation and with deep joy at the very beautiful and impressive Free Church service.

As some one put it, all Orders and all Eucharists are invalid, or at least incomplete, so long as the Body is divided; they without us, and we without them, cannot be made perfect. The change is startling from the time when each Church could claim to be *the* Church, and to stand for the pure unadulterated truth from which all others had fallen away in a greater or less degree. And local gatherings in this new spirit are bound to be fruitful.

In the discussion which took place about the basis of Church membership there was an apparently unanimous agreement that any form of credal or sacramental test was impossible. In view of the fact that neither of the Fellowships is formed on the basis of theological liberalism, and that many of their members would repudiate any such name, the consensus is remarkable and encouraging. The point at issue in this connexion was mainly whether a definite acceptance of the Challenge of Christ should be required from the adult, or whether it was to be assumed from the fact of his associating himself with the Christian Society. All agreed that the profession of Christianity should be a reality, and that it should be understood as implying a personal identification with the Kingdom of God; the question was whether this could be secured or helped by any kind of external test or declaration.

Lastly, it is noticeable that more than one Free Church speaker expressed a strong sense of the defect of inspiration in the central and official assemblies of their Churches. They could feel the presence of the Spirit in small local bodies met for discussion or business more surely than in these. In view of the fact that they are representative and democratically elected, the warning is relevant to us of the Church of England. We must not assume that by improving machinery (however desirable this may be) we are at once going to secure the expression of the true mind of the Church or the authentic voice of the Spirit in our new assemblies. As it was well put, the problem of the future is to make the mind of the local Church available for the whole, and to bring the mind of the whole into the local Church. No denomination has yet solved this problem. We have not in fact discovered how to ascertain the mind even of any single one of the Churches; the difficulty in a federated group of Churches would be far greater. We all talk about the need of the Church being able to speak with a united and authoritative voice, but we need a good deal of hard thinking as to the channels through which this voice may be expected to express itself.

THE NEMESIS OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

The Oxford movement was beyond doubt the great religious movement of the nineteenth century in England. It partook of the nature of a counter-Reformation, and many of its protagonists crossed the Rubicon into the Church of Rome. Whether this course was a logical necessity or not is a question that we are not bound to answer; learned men, such as Pusey and Newman, had the same data before them, and to a very great extent accepted the same premises; and yet one went, and the other stayed. It has been said that Newman went because he was John Henry Newman, and Pusey stayed because he was Edward Bouverie Pusey; and no one will deny that the psychological element in a man's convictions is very great.

The movement, we have said, was in the nature of a counter-Reformation, and though most High Churchmen would not wish to deny this, and many would glory in it, it is only fair to explain the statement. Pater has told us that the Reformation should be studied in connection with the Renaissance, of which it was the religious side. Now the genius of the Renaissance was in the nature of a revolt against Mediaevalism in Literature, in Art, in Morals. It stood for freedom. What, however, the Protestant Reformers strove for was not freedom, but truth in religion.

That a man had, as a man, a right to his own religion was no more believed by the Reformers than by the Romanists. The Protestant who suffered death for his religion did not regard himself, as a man would who suffered to-day, as dying for his right to have his own religion; he regarded himself as a martyr for the true religion against the false; his personal right did not enter his head, and he would probably be so far from believing in each man's right to his own religion that he would himself be a persecutor if his own party gained the upper hand. The idea of each man's right to his own religion is of much later

date than the Reformation. As far as England is concerned it came in in the late Stuart period. Certainly "civil and religious liberty" was a watchword of the Whigs at the time of what is sometimes called the Revolution, a rather formidable term for that sedate and bloodless change of dynasty and government.

The idea, however, gradually made its way, and the various disabilities hampering Protestant Dissenters were removed bit by bit, though Roman Catholics did not receive the franchise till less than a century ago. There is a story told that when the then Pope heard of this, he did not exhibit the joy that those who gave him the news expected. He remarked that it was a triumph for religious indifference. Whether this story is true or not, the words attributed to the Pope are not without significance. The Established Church at that time was in a very sleepy state, and part of the mission of the Tractarians was to wake it up.

How did they wake it up? Their plan included much that may quite fairly be described as a counter-Reformation. At the Restoration of Charles II., the bishops also were restored. It was this which made the Oxford movement possible, for episcopal government was the *sine qua non* of Tractarianism, although the Tractarian view of the necessity of bishops was not any part of the official teaching of the Reformed Church of England during the period between the time of the Reformation and that of the Oxford movement. The nearest approach to it is to be found in the rule that persons without episcopal ordination are not to minister in Anglican Churches, but there was no pretence that this was anything but a disciplinary regulation.

The "judicious" Hooker looked on the question of episcopacy as a matter of what he called "polity;" it was a question to him of the *bene esse* of the Church, not of its *esse*. He did not regard it as an essential. The essential of a thing is that which makes it be what it is, and the Oxford movement taught a

doctrine never taught officially in the Church of England since the Reformation, namely, that episcopacy is needful to make a religious body a true branch of the Church of Christ.

What is the essential of a Christian Church? What makes it Christian? Is it a particular form of government, or is it faith in and obedience to Christ? The Oxford movement so accentuated the necessity of ecclesiastical ordinances that it unconsciously—materially rather than formally—neglected the weightier matters of love and truth.

The movement nevertheless had strong points. It held up the banner of a supernatural faith before the eyes of the careless and materialistic; it raised the standard of duty among the clergy, and of devotion among the laity. For a long time it seemed as though the moderate members of the party, as distinguished from the extremists, would become so numerous that those in the Church of England who belonged to the Broad and Evangelical parties would be almost crowded out. This tendency increased, we think, till about twenty-five years ago, and it is since then that there has been a considerable reaction. What has caused this reaction? Sacerdotal religion, whether Roman, Eastern, or High Anglican, has always contained one element of weakness, and that has been a tendency towards a mistaken exaltation of religious ordinances as compared with moral action. Anyone who has lived in Italy or Spain—France hardly counts,—will know that there are thousands who would rather steal five pounds than eat meat on Friday, and would rather break some contiguous commandment than miss hearing Mass on Sunday.

Now this attitude of mind was unconsciously fostered, especially in clerical circles, by the Oxford movement, whereas among the rank and file of the English laity there has been a steadily strengthening tendency in the opposite direction, namely, a tendency to look at what may be termed the moral values of religion. Religion has come to be regarded more and more by the laity as a sanction for ethics; and a religion

the ethical standard of which seems unnatural and strained, and which seems to give its particular precepts precedence over the broad rules of right and wrong, has steadily lost grip.

At no time in the world's history has the sense of duty to one's neighbour been so strong and sensitive as it is now, and at no time have people been so much inclined to ask of, and expect from, the Church the guidance, advice, and sanction in matters of social duty that they had previously only asked from it in matters of dogmatic religion. A Church-goer now expects a sermon to be helpful in his daily life as a citizen, and preachers who satisfy this demand have no reason to complain of empty churches. Such subjects as the duties of rich to poor, of employer and employé; the difficulty of reconciling the words of the Lord about forgiveness with the necessity for the punishment of crime; all these things are among those in which the average Church-goer looks, almost pathetically, to the pulpit for inspiration; or at least for some assurance that Christianity is able to guide the world into a better social condition where there will be less grinding poverty, less ignorance, less vice. This growing interest in the social and moral value of Christianity has led to a decline of interest in its dogmatic teaching and its ecclesiastical practices. This has cut at the root of the Oxford movement, which whatever the social teaching or activities of its modern adherents may be, yet depends for its distinctive character upon its dogmatic and ecclesiastical views. It is this insistence on the dogmatic and ecclesiastical side of the Christian religion by the Oxford movement which has produced a wide separation of thought and feeling between the clergy and laity, and this is the Nemesis of the Oxford Movement. The things that matter to three-fourths of the clergy, are of no importance at all to nine-tenths of the laity. Hence a condition of unstable equilibrium has supervened in the National Church, and unless this can be quickly remedied inevitable disaster must ensue.

N. Prower.

THE ASCENSION.[1]

By Canon M. G. Glazebrook, D.D.

"Go unto my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God."—*S. John* xx. 17.

It was John Locke, I believe, who first drew men's attention to the way in which all the terms employed to express abstract ideas are images drawn from the objects of sense. We are all quite familiar with the fact that our common speech, the plainest garment in which we can clothe our daily thoughts, is a web woven out of metaphors, once vivid but now faded out of recognition. But we do not all recognise the parallel phenomenon which is observable in the language of religion. Very many of the current phrases, which are to us the conventional expression of familiar truths, are neither more nor less than history which has faded into symbol. Whether the form of historical statement is preserved, or whether the event in question is only implied by some allusive phrase or epithet, all the emphasis often rests upon the idea which is to be conveyed, while the event, no longer treated as literal fact, serves, by a kind of metaphor, as the picturesque embodiment of a spiritual truth.

The history of religion offers many illustrations of the silent operation of this principle. A partial and misapplied recognition of it inspired the Euhemerist commentators on Homer. Origen, in his elaborate interpretation of Scripture, was guided by a conception which came nearer to the truth, but it was obscured by his theory of inspiration. We need not, however, travel far afield, for nowhere can better examples be found than in the familiar pages of the Old Testament. Let us briefly refer to two of these which are typical.

When Deborah and Barak sang of their victory, and said—

> "Lord, when Thou wentest out of Seir, when Thou marchedst out of the field of Edom, the earth trembled, the heavens also dropped, yea, the clouds dropped water,"

[1] A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, on Ascension Day, 1917.

they, or the poet who spoke for them, were doubtless describing what they regarded as an actual event. At least, they were not far removed from the time when men regarded Jehovah as in very truth "the earth shaker." It was not so with the post-exilic poet, who, perhaps seven hundred years later, used language very similar:—

> "Then the earth shook and trembled, the foundations of the mountains moved, and were shaken, because he was wroth. There went up a smoke out of his nostrils and fire out of his mouth devoured —coals were kindled by it."

In these verses of the 18th Psalm we recognise, not a description of an actual event, as the writer conceived it, but the eloquence of a poetical convention. This picture of a God

> "who rode upon a cherub and did fly; yea He flew swiftly upon the wings of the wind,"

was no invention of the Psalmist. I venture to say that it could never have been invented by any conscious process: for such deliberate creation could never be plausible; far less could it appeal to us after all the centuries. It is just because our fathers long ago believed that gods might thus appear, and move and do battle, and because their blood runs in our veins, that their old language rises to our lips when we do homage to the God of nature. There is a difference. The same phrase which for them was history, for us is symbol. And yet behind history and symbol alike lies the same truth, conceived in different degrees of dimness.

Again, when the great prophet of the exile appeals to the God of Israel to aid His people, saying—

> "Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord. Art thou not it that cut Rahab in pieces, that pierced the dragon?"

he is employing the old Semitic legend of creation as a poetical ornament, not expressing a personal belief. The sentence would have been neither poetry nor ornament, had not the ancestors of his race once fully believed the whole grim story of Marduk and Tiamat. As it is, the legend, unforgotten though obsolete, supplies the poet with an image, at once religious and imaginative, which stamps his thought upon the

memory of every discerning reader. There is no need to multiply examples, when each of my hearers can supply them in abundance from his own observation. Rather I would point to the conclusion which may be based upon a multitude of such instances.

Not the least essential difference between religion and philosophy is this: that while philosophy takes its rise among the favoured few, the men of leisure and opportunity, and slowly penetrates downward into the mass, all great religions have been first accepted by the common people, and only by slow degrees recognised by the favoured few. When St. Paul wrote "God chose the foolish things of the world that He might put to shame them that are wise," he was thinking only of the Gospel; but his words have a general bearing also. For no religion can be great or universal in character which does not appeal to man as man, in a way that the simple can understand.

From this general truth one consequence follows inevitably. Each great religion, in the early stages of its history, must speak the language of the common people. Not only the words in which it is preached, but the forms of thought, the types of narrative, through which it is presented, must be adapted to their capacity of understanding. And the stronger its appeal, the greater the enthusiasm which it rouses, the more certainly will its presentation be coloured by the minds through which it passes. Most human souls are capable of poetic feeling when deeply stirred. But only the few have the gift of utterance. The rest are dumb; and the poetry of the dumb is miracle. That is why the earliest records of each great world religion contain elements of the miraculous for which their founders were not responsible. When such is the case, it ought not to be regarded as a defect, but rather as a proof that the religion justified its claim by touching the hearts and stirring the imagination of the toiling multitude. Each great religion, too, has been presented in terms of the science of the

age. It was inevitable: for any doctrine which contradicted universally held conceptions of the world would at once be rejected as meaningless: and no religion, however purely spiritual, can be entirely free from contact with cosmogony or astronomy.

All this is so commonplace, in the abstract, that from you it can only claim an impatient acceptance: but it may acquire a a new character when brought to bear upon a living issue.

Such an issue is put plainly before us by the epistle for the day, which reminds us of the debate which has now been maintained for many years about the interpretation of certain clauses in the Apostles' Creed. The product of an age which believed the earth to be the immovable centre of the universe, containing in its bowels the dark cavern of Hades, and over-arched by a solid vault which was the floor of heaven, the Creed could not be formulated except in terms of that belief. Four of its clauses depend for their meaning upon the Ptolemaic conception of the world.

> "He descended into Hell, He ascended into Heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of God. From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

After much painful hesitation, all educated Christians are now agreed that these clauses, implying a picture of the universe which is wholly obsolete, can no longer be regarded as historical. But at the same time they claim for them a permanent value as symbolical. Have they a right to do so? Surely they have: for the same principle applies to these clauses as to the examples of religious language which I quoted just now from the Old Testament. Each of them, because for long ages it was the literal expression of Christian belief, is fitted in our new age—as no modern phrases could be—to serve for a symbol of an abiding truth which every generation tries to conceive, but all imperfectly.

It is the second of these clauses which demands our special consideration to-day. What do we mean when we say "He ascended into heaven?" Of what reality are those words the

symbol? For a short time after the Resurrection Jesus now and again manifested Himself to some of His disciples, assuring them thereby that He lived to be their Lord and Saviour. That assurance given, a change of state followed, which we can only describe in terms of the space which conditions all our thought. He passed, as we say, into that realm of spirit where immanence and transcendence are one: and there, freed from the limitations of earthly existence, the high priest of humanity is consciously one with the Father.

The moment we try, as I have been doing, to express our faith about these matters in plain words, paradox and antinomy warn us that language will not stand the strain. What better proof do we require that our wiser course is to rest content with symbols, especially with those to which time has given an elastic connotation? For my own part, I am glad to do so. But for that reason I am jealous of a modern attempt which has been made to give the connotation a new rigidity. It is the outcome of a laudable desire to reconcile St. Luke's narrative of the Ascension with the modern conception of the universe. So far as I know, the theory originated with a teacher whose name is justly venerated in Cambridge, and to whose writings I am myself a grateful debtor. But *amicus Plato, magis amica veritas*. Submission to Bishop Westcott's mere authority would be an ill tribute to his memory. With all respect, therefore, I venture to give reasons for dissent from his opinion.

It is common ground that, since the earth is a flying ball in illimitable space, where nothing even faintly corresponds to the fabled vault of heaven, the proposition that Jesus "ascended into heaven" has in the literal sense no meaning at all. What explanation, then, can be given to St. Luke's narrative? To many of us, if not most, the natural conclusion seems the right one. The story is peculiar to St. Luke, and he tells it in two versions which do not agree. Like his account of the fiery tongues at Pentecost, it bears the mark of its origin in popular imagination. We might even venture to say that, given the

ancient conception of the world, some such story must have arisen out of popular attempts to answer the question, "How did the Lord pass from the sight of men?" The story, as we have it, would thus be a natural growth from the soil of Jerusalem. And just because it was so natural, so congruous to the spirit of the age, it was accepted almost without question by St. Luke, and through his influence by the Church at large.

Not altogether without protest. The fourth Evangelist, if I mistake not, has indicated his disapproval of the popular realism of St. Luke's narrative. He never contradicts his predecessors; but he often gently corrects what he considers their mistakes, here by a pointed omission, there by a variety of detail, there by the turn of a phrase. In my text we may recognise a fine example of his delicate art. For he tells how the risen Lord, appearing to Mary Magdalene, gives her a message for the disciples: "Say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God." Such a message would be wholly superfluous, if He intended to assemble the apostles to witness a formal and visible ascension. Can we doubt that the evangelist, who so constantly warns his readers not to put the material in the place of the spiritual, reported that message for the purpose of discrediting the story which had so recently become popular? But his gentle protest failed of effect at the time, and in our day has failed even to attract attention.

Bishop Westcott and his followers, on the other hand, unwilling to admit such an error on the part of St. Luke, have adopted a theory which is intended to reconcile his narrative with the facts established by modern science. It may be stated in a few words. Wishing to teach His disciples the truth that He was returning to the Father, Jesus adopted the only method by which it was possible to convey the right idea to their untrained minds. After the example of the ancient prophets, He put the lesson into the form of an acted parable. He assembled the disciples upon Olivet, and before their eyes

rose visibly from the ground for a space, so as to give the impression that He was literally ascending to the vault of heaven; and then covered Himself with a cloud, which veiled whatever transformation may have followed.

Surely it is a grave abuse of language to describe this action as a parable! A parable consists of two parts: an action, real or imagined, but always of the normal kind, such as might be seen in common life, and a discourse explaining the truth which it illustrates. Now, in the case we are considering, neither of these elements is present; for the action is essentially abnormal, and no explanation could be given in words without destroying the impression which the miracle was designed to produce. The point of the whole scene, on this theory, lies in the fact that it was not explained. Clearly, on this supposition, the right name for the scene is not parable but drama. Drama serves many high purposes, and teaches many noble lessons to an audience, who, though carried away by its magic, are not deceived. But what of the drama, enacted without a stage, by which the spectators are deceived? Upon such drama judgment has been pronounced in some familiar words: "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees—actors that you are—*ὑπόκριται.*" To whom were these words addressed? To some highly respectable religious leaders who—for the edification of others, as they would claim—made a show of their charities, posed in their prayers, and dramatised their fasting. And this judgment was no exception, but the rule. If we may trust the records, there is no fault which Jesus more emphatically condemned than the posing which makes religion histrionic. And yet we are invited to believe that He, whose transparent simplicity of word and action entirely conformed to the standard by which He measured others, spent His last moments upon earth as the chief actor in an edifying dramatic representation!

Reconciliations are generally made at the expense of a third party. That is true. But are St. Luke and modern science to be reconciled at the expense of Our Blessed Lord's own

character for truth and consistency? In order to acquit the Evangelist on but one of several charges against his critical acumen, shall we confess that his Master was not free from the histrionic taint which He so often denounced in the Pharisees? For my part, I am not prepared to pay the price which this modern heresy demands, for the solution of a secondary problem. Secondary it is. For, no matter which view we take of St Luke's narrative, there remains unaffected the uncompromising language of the Apostles' Creed, which the Church maintained in its literal sense for fifteen hundred years.

That is the fact we have to face. We can face it without flinching if we apply the principle of development which, as I have tried to show, is commended by the general history of religion. We can say that a beautiful story, the natural creation of the dramatic instinct which is so strong in popular piety, was welcomed by an unscientific generation, and regarded as literal truth. We can recognise that for ages the story served, not unworthily, to enshrine the mystery which it appeared to reveal. And now that we know it for a shrine only, we can still maintain it in a place of honour, as a consecrated symbol of a reality which cannot be unveiled to mortal eyes. It is upon that mysterious reality, not upon outward forms, that faith in all ages has been fixed. Where would faith be without mystery? Surely it is to rebuke the craving for such outward forms that the fourth Gospel tells us how Thomas, the doubter, was answered about the Ascension. "Whither I go ye know the way," the Lord had said. Thomas insisted, "Lord, we know not whither Thou goest; how can we know the way?" How did Jesus answer him? Did he say "Ye shall see me ascend into heaven, and then you will know all?" Not so. Putting aside, as irrevelant, all the curiosity of materialism, He spoke a single phrase, baffling but satisfactory, luminous but mysterious: "I am the way." The link between earth and heaven is not an aëry path but a divine person. He that is in Christ has found the Way.

AN ORIENTAL THEOLOGY.[1]

In the chapter entitled "Meditation," Sir Rabindranath Tagore takes for his meditation a text, the phrases of which have "been gathered from different places of our oldest Scriptures—the Vedas:" the words, though not to be found in one consecutive order in any one place, are all collected "from the immortal storehouse of inexhaustible wisdom—the Vedas and Upanishads." Together they seem to run somewhat as follows:—O Infinite, Perfect, Eternal! Thou art our Father. Awaken in us the consciousness of that truth. To Thee I bow; may I do so truly. Thou art my Father smite me not with death. From the world of sins deliver me. Give us that which is good. To Thee I bow from whom come the enjoyments of life, the welfare of man, who art good, who art the highest good.

From Sir Rabindranath's meditation on this text, or rather on these texts, we may take one or two points. In our prayers we may, and sometimes do, use words "mechanically without applying our whole mind to realize their fulness." In our meditation therefore we have to understand more deeply what "Father" means, "and so to put our heart in harmony with its truth." In that word, realised in its fulness, lies the whole difference between religion and science.

When we have the scientific idea of the world in our minds as a world of force and matter, our relation to it is conceived as purely mechanical—it is a machine, and we are part of the mechanism. And if we look, as science looks, upon this world "merely as a combination of forces, then there can be no question of worship." But if, with science, we stop there, "we miss the highest truth that is in man. For what is man? He is a personal being." By science the universe is conceived as impersonal: personality in the view of science, it has none. The great laws which govern the universe science discovers, but "when we come to our personal nature, we do not know any law which explains it," that is to say "science ignores the very basis of truth about ourselves." But we are part of the universe. Any account of the universe therefore which deliberately ignores the existence of personality must, however scientific it be—indeed, we may say, that precisely because it is scientific it must—be misleading.

But, when we have the religious idea of the world in our minds as a world of personality, our relation to it is no longer conceived as mechanical. What then is the relationship of man—a finite personality—to the Infinite, Perfect, Eternal? To that question man has the answer in his heart of hearts: "it is the closest of all relationships,—the relationship of love." "Because we have loved and find in love the infinite satisfaction of our personality, therefore we have come to know that our relationship to the Infinite Personality is that of love." "We have to be born into this great idea of the Father. That is the end and object of man, the fulfilment of his life."

---

[1] *Personality*, by Sir Rabindranath Tagore. Macmillan & Co., London, 1917. 5/- net.

When Sir Rabindranath's prayer proceeds: O smite me not with death, he does not mean physical death, "because we all know that we must die:" he means "give me the life which comes out of Thine own nature." Deliver me from the world of sin, is "the prayer we use when we want to realize full consciousness of life in our Father. The great obstacle is the selfish life." Give us what is good, is the prayer to God, "not for worldly goods, but for the establishment of complete relationship in the Father." The welfare which comes from him "contains in it both the joys and sorrows of life, loss and gain. To Thee who givest pain, sorrow, and bereavement, to Thee who art good, the highest good—to Thee I bow."

Elsewhere in the book—to leave now the chapter on Meditation—we find that the welfare which is our ideal consists in giving up: "perpetual giving up is the truth of life." It is through privations, by renouncing the life of plenty that we have "to seek entrance into the realm of blessedness."[1] Not only is there suffering in life, but "our greatest hope is in this, that suffering is there," for "this suffering has driven man with his prayer to knock at the gate of the infinite in him, the divine, thus revealing his deepest instinct, his unreasoning faith in the reality of the ideal,—the faith shewn in the readiness for death, in the renunciation of all that belongs to the self." "In the sorrow of death, and suffering of despair, when trust has been betrayed, and love desecrated, when existence becomes tasteless and unmeaning, man standing upon the ruins of his hopes stretches his hands to the heavens to feel the touch of the Person across his darkened world." The Person is "the Infinite One who is revealed in the unity of all personalities; who gives truth to sacrifice of self, to death which leads to a larger life, and to loss which leads to a greater gain; who turns the emptiness of renunciation into fulfilment by his own fulness."[2]

Since it is in suffering that man's "deepest instinct" is revealed, and by loss that we are led to a greater gain, it may be of interest to follow what Sir Rabindranath has to say on Good and Evil. What is evil for a tree is whatever checks its inter-relationship and "harmony with its world of the sun and the soil and the seasons," whatever hinders the tree from becoming more perfect in its individuality. The animal has a "world of knowledge and feeling," and a fuller relationship to maintain with its world: it has to know and to seek its food and its mate, and all obstacles to the development of its relationship to its world are evils. For the animal there is conflict between what is and what is desired, whereas in man "the conflict is between what *is* desired and what *should be* desired." Many things that are good for the animal life in man are evil for his true life, which "is in the region of what ought to be." The animal life is the life of desire: the life of purpose is the life of human personality and of the moral world. "Whatever hinders this life of man from establishing proper relationship with its moral world is

[1] Sir Rabindranath uses the word "blessedness," but does not quote the words "Blessed are the poor," "Blessed are they which are persecuted," "Blessed are they which mourn."

[2] Sir Rabindranath does not quote the words: "Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven."

an evil. It is death—a far greater evil than the death of the natural life." The animal is guided by pleasure and pain; its movement is from what is to what is desired. In man there is purpose and will—the possibility of moving in the direction of what *should be* desired; consequently there is the possibility of freedom from the guidance of pleasure and pain, from the narrowness of self-desire. The will, if and when it thus attains freedom, becomes good, that is discovers or discerns "a world transcending the moral world," as the moral world itself transcends the animal's world of desire. The discipline of moral life, however, is not an end in itself: it is but a means of bringing us into a higher world. Goodness, in morality, must itself have a meaning, must be good for something, for some end or purpose. In what end or purpose, then, does it find its meaning? and wherein does it differ from evil? Goodness finds its perfection, and so its meaning and its end, in love. And "this feeling of perfection" is "the feeling of the perfect oneness:" it discloses to us "the world of the Infinite One, who is revealed in the unity of all personalities." We are not only members one of another, but He is in us and we in Him. In becoming aware of our relationship to the Infinite One we become aware also of the division between Him and us. But though there be separation, there may also be harmony "between the individual One in us and the Universal One in infinity."

Life is the relationship between finite creatures and the Infinite One—a relationship which may exist in various degrees, and which may be promoted or impaired. What promotes it is good, what impairs it is evil. But good and evil are not only known to our minds in this way, which may seem a somewhat abstract and metaphysical way. They are also directly felt in our hearts. By the animal and by the natural man evil is felt, though its nature be not known: it is felt as pain. If and when known, evil is known at first as an obstacle to the relationship which the tree, the animal, the natural man, must maintain in order to live, and must develop in order to grow. But the evil which hurts the soul, the evil which is sin, "may not be all realized in pain, yet it is evil . . . for it hinders life's ultimate purpose." The "ultimate purpose" is the complete union of "this Eternal Person and this finite little person." What promotes the union is love—love, in which Personality finds its highest expression. Love promotes union between human beings or persons: what disintegrates their union is called crime. "Crime is against man," as "sin is against the divine in us." As it is by the "incessant movement of renunciation" that the human personality grows, "whatever checks that freedom of endless growth is sin, which is the evil that works against man's eternity."

As love, which manifests itself in renunciation, grows, joy (which is not the same thing as happiness) increases. What then is it that renunciation renounces? Not self in the sense of personality, but self in the sense of the exclusion of other personalities, of hostility to them, in the sense of making them subordinate to one's own personality, of making one's own personality dominant and supreme. It may perhaps be supposed that such dilation of "this finite little person" is the tendency of life wherever it is found: the tree is engaged in a struggle against the universe, as is the animal also.

But this supposition only takes part of the truth into account: the tree or the animal must also be in harmony with its environment if it is to grow, or to continue in existence. And if the environment is essential to the individual plants or animals, they help to constitute the environment of each and every other individual. If their diversity is undoubted, the unity in which alone they can exist is indubitable also.

Renunciation can hardly be predicated of plants: it is to some extent predicable of animals, for they will in some instances give up their lives in defence of their young. It becomes plainly manifest in the case of man; and in man the personality also becomes manifest which though it may be surmised to be beginning in animals can scarcely be ascribed to plants. Renunciation proceeds from love; and "it is not true that animals do not feel love," or that they have no personality.

Personality, then, and the love which exists only between persons, and the renunciation which proceeds from love, are closely intertwined in their nature and their growth. They manifest the unity which is "the nature of Reality." But "the nature of Reality," according to Sir Rabindranath, is "the variedness of its unity." Its unity admits of degrees. Its nature exhibits itself in movement. And the movement may be in the direction of renunciation—or not. Crime is the refusal to renounce, the resolve to aggrandise oneself at the cost of other human beings: "crime is against man," against one's fellow-man. It works against that union of man with his fellows which is a reality, which is the basis of society, and without which man could not continue to exist. But sin "is against the divine in us." Whereas crime consists in the resolve to set oneself ruthlessly above all others who stand in our way, sin consists in setting oneself against and above the divine in us. The simple fact to which crime closes its eyes is that we are all in society, and society is in each one of us—we are all (in words which Sir Rabindranath does not use) members one of another. The fact that we are in God—in whom we live and move and have our being—and that He is in us, is one in the light of which what is admitted to be crime is felt to be sin. Sin is against the divine which is in us, and in which we are. It is the refusal to renounce; it is the denial of love, the slow suicide of the soul, in the attempt which is vain to gain the whole world.

In reading Sir Rabindranath Tagore's *Personality* we escape from the obsession that psychology is philosophy, and from the fixed idea that philosophy without Kant is impossible. Evolution, too, is a word which, I think, is not to be found in the book; and it is perhaps right to call attention to this fact, because it may seem from what has been said above, as though Sir Rabindranath were pledged to some form of the theory of evolution. In the chapter from which we have quoted above, his starting-point is "inanimate nature," though he dismisses it at once, on the ground that we know only how it appears to us, not what it is. "But the curtain rises, life appears on the stage, and the drama begins." It begins apparently with plant life; it proceeds in the life of the animal, in whom are the rudiments, at least, of personality and love; it reaches a higher stage in the moral life of man; it culminates in a still higher stage, "a world where all our

disciplines of moral life find their ultimate truth." But though apparently these are successive, chronological stages, each of which is evolved from that which precedes it, and all have been evolved from "inanimate nature," it is pretty clear that Sir Rabindranath does not so regard them. Personality, in his view, is not the last outcome of a temporal process of change; it is the Reality, which underlies everything and without which nothing could exist; and the Reality in which we move and live and have our being, is Personality. If then, by "inanimate nature" is meant something which has, or ever had, existence apart from personality, it is, on Sir Rabindranath's argument, an abstraction, and an abstraction which involves a contradiction in terms. The Real is not merely a manifestation to a person, it is also the manifestation of personality. Reality is a unity, but Sir Rabindranath says that in the unity there is variedness; and we may therefore, perhaps, say that he would admit that there are degrees of reality. The unity, as we know it, is not perfect; but there is a striving after it—and a falling away from it. It is from the unity here and now before us that every attempt—scientific or religious—to understand it must start. We may analyse—or think we analyse it—into the "here" and the "there," or into the "now" and the "then." That method, the method of analysis, is the method of science. It brings the universe "to the brink of dissolution." It analyses reality, the context of personality, into persons and things; and arranges them in a temporal order, in which "inanimate nature" is prior to personality. And what it has thus in imagination put asunder it cannot put together again, even in imagination. For practical purposes the method of analysis has immense advantages, *e.g.*, the analysis of an event into cause and effect. But the distinction between cause and effect is one which science no longer insists upon as real or even conceivable. Analysis "leads but to the grave"—not to the source of all reality. The alternative method is not to analyse the unity which is here and now, not to try to get rid of it, but to accept it, to take our stand upon the reality of personality, and not to be lured away from it, but to seek to understand everything in the light of personality, which alone enlightens the world. The only things known are things known to some personality. If we assume the existence of things unknown to any personality whatever, and proceed to speculate upon them, we can only speculate on them as they would be if known to some personality or other—that is to say, we don't get out of the region of personality after all. The things of the assumption are hypothetical; and by the very terms of the hypothesis they are assumed to be such as are the things known to us, that is, the hypothetical things, if like the things known to us, imply a hypothetical personality. If they do not, they are totally unlike the things known to us; and in that case they bear no relation whatever to the things which are known to us. In fine, the hypothesis of things unknown to any personality whatever, is not only useless but is self-contradictory, self-destructive—just as self-destructive as the assumption of a personality which has nothing to be conscious of. A personality conscious of nothing, and things of which no personality is conscious, are not only abstractions, but meaningless abstractions.

Since then Sir Rabindranath sees this, and insists upon it, it is unfortunate and misleading that, in the section of his book on which we are commenting, he should have spoken as though "inanimate things" were the first stage in a process, and the stage out of which or after which life and personality proceeded. It would, however, be doing a monstrous injustice to this extraordinarily fine book to end the notice of it with a note of dissent and discord. Its philosophical interest, its religions interest, are of the highest; and the beauty of its language, like the beauty of its thought, is "a thing of joy."

F. B. Jevons.

THE CHURCH IN THE FURNACE.[1]

(Second Review).

This series of papers by seventeen chaplains working with the army in France naturally deserves the most careful consideration. The papers were written under great stress, and in the midst of most trying surroundings. The battlefield is naturally a place for emotion and resolve rather than for thought; and we could not expect carefully reasoned views. But we shall at our peril neglect the impressions of men who have taken a plunge into the sea of realities, physical and spiritual. There is no uniformity among the writers, and it would be easy for a caviller to place side by side the most inconsistent statements from different pages. We must also remember that an outlook forced upon clergymen by a time of stress may not be altogether suitable to quieter times, whensoever they return. Yet every one of the writers has things to say which are worthy of careful thought.

In the general impression produced by the book two points are very noteworthy. One is that all the writers seem to have reached a sense of spiritual things, of the ultimate grounds of personality, which they would scarcely have reached in a quiet English vicarage. The other is the extraordinary ignorance of the ground principles of Christianity which prevails among our soldiers. This note is struck again and again. The men in khaki seem to come to Christianity as to something strange and unfamiliar, with which perhaps they have not much concern, but out of which they are willing, if they can, to get some good. I think that few of us had realized how small are the religious circles in England; and how little, outside of them, Christian worship even exists for the generality of people. No one can now imagine that the English Church has succeeded in its teaching capacity.

It will be well to take, for more detailed study, two or three of the seventeen papers. Those which will most interest modern churchmen are mostly written by chaplains of Oxford and Cambridge Colleges. The papers of Mr. Barry, of Oriel, and of Mr. Milner-White, of King's, are especially rich in suggestion.

[1] Edited by F. C. Macnutt. (Macmillan & Co.).

Mr. Barry calls his essay *Faith in the light of War*. He writes:—

> "Some things, long accepted, do not fit the facts of our experience, and therefore cannot be admitted true." "What we need now is a creed that is bold enough to state essential things essentially." "And first, I think we see how lamentably inadequate is the traditional idea of God."

Mr. Barry develops the notion, to which many earnest writers of late have had recourse, of a finite and struggling deity, who works with man for the coming of the divine kingdom, but who is opposed and often thwarted by the power of evil. He allows that God in his eternal existence may be infinite and perfect; but holds that in his *manward aspect* he is a being limited and striving. This is evidently a form of the dualism which many recent writers have revived: and one may say that in times of real stress and agony forms of dualism will always arise.

Mr. Barry is bold in what we may call modernity. He is convinced that

> "each age must emphasize some one particular aspect of Christianity, and none must think that it can see the whole."

He even ventures to say:—

> "I am quite prepared to see such large developments in the coming form of Christianity that the religion of our sons and grandsons would seem to be almost another faith, if it were witnessed by our grandfathers."

And these changes are based on the continued experience of the Church.

> "A direct and simple treatment of religion as a matter of *experience*, using modern thoughts and phraseology, is always listened to with rapt attention."

Hence the need for changes in the Church of England.

> "One feels bound to say, quite brutally, that if the Church of England is in the future what it was before the war, we have lost these men for Christ irrevocably." "The next few years, I believe, will give the decision whether Christianity will, or will not, be the world's religion."

It is suitable to turn from Mr. Barry's appeal to a longer and more detailed essay by Mr. Milner-White on the changes in the Prayer-Book and our services, suggested by experience at the front. It seems that all chaplains have been obliged to depart in some ways from the authorized formulae. While in some cases the changes may be necessitated only by stress of conditions, in other cases they are very valuable as shewing tendencies really at work. For example, near the trenches the evening is often the only possible time for the communion, and Mr. Milner-White points out that in factory towns the conditions are in this respect similar.

Of all the special services of our Church that for burial is perhaps the least satisfactory; and the writer says that in France it is *never* used as it stands. The litany is found to be too cold and severe, beautiful though parts of it may be. The prayers in Matins and Evensong are not very effective: partly because they expect a too high level of education in religion. Of course Mr. Milner-White recognizes the obvious blemishes of the ordinary services, the unedifying character of many lessons and psalms, the redundancy

of the prayers for the King, and the omission of prayers for those really in authority, and so on. But he goes further, and asks for more liberty; that there should be a fixed framework or scheme, but great liberality should be allowed in filling it up. There seems to be in France a generally recognized scheme; general confession, absolution, Lord's prayer, versicles and creed. But this is obviously an "express" service, and something much better might be devised for more quiet times.

Each chaplain is naturally attached to a particular school in the Church; and this fact colours their views. Mr. Milner-White is evidently somewhat high-church. But what he says about the communion and the enrichment of our ritual by fresh services deserves consideration. He would have a popular devotion which

> "might aim at re-enacting the life of Christ, of entering into His longings, at picturing His love and work, His Incarnation, Passion, Triumph."

He would introduce also

> "a Litany of Devotion to the Saints, to help cleanse the rust from our belief in the Communion of Saints."

He approves of reservation of the sacrament, and even ventures to write that

> "the wayside Calvaries have persuaded more prayers than all the chaplains put together."

We know from an abundance of testimony that war has in many cases a tendency to make men relish what may be called the ritual and emotional side of religion. But whether the hard-headed artizans and miners of England will in ordinary times be attracted by a return to the customs and ideas of primitive religion, many of which have been absorbed by Catholicism, remains to be seen. In the past this has taken place quite exceptionally.

A counterblast to the tendency to excess in sacramental religion will be found in Mr. Neville Talbot's paper on the Training of the Clergy, a breezy paper, full of wisdom and common-sense. Mr. Talbot has had elsewhere his say as to the religion of the battle-field; and here dwells on a matter of the utmost practical importance, if somewhat less stirring. What he says as to the incomplete "half-baked" character of the training of the clergy is quite true. The root of the mischief he takes to be the shortness of the period of preparation, one year at a theological college, after an University education usually of a superficial kind. We have lately heard from the pulpit of St. Mary's at Oxford an attack on the efficacy of training colleges; to which the Principal of Cuddesdon replied, from the same pulpit, that the colleges made what they could of the very imperfectly educated material sent them. Mr. Talbot is quite right. There is the utmost need of an intellectual levelling up of the clergy. Before people have given up listening to the sermon, it should be improved in quality, and used for more definite purposes. The ignorance of the great principles of Christianity, of which our chaplains complain, arises in great part because the clergy know so little about them; and so devote themselves to unending services, attended by

very few, or to social working, which laymen can often do better, that they have no time or energy to teach, and to learn, which is, after all, a necessary preliminary to teaching.

One would welcome a parallel series of papers by men who have been trying to work on religious lines in connection with the Young Men's Christian Association, or the Student Christian Movement.

P. GARDNER.

[This review was written without any reference to the review of the same volume which appeared in our April number, and is from an entirely different standpoint.—ED. *M.C.*].

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.[1]

English theological scholars owe a great debt to the late Professor Swete as a textual critic, a New Testament exegete, a patristic theologian. Just before his death, in March, 1917, he all but completed the editing of a volume of essays on the early history of the Church and Ministry. The essays are six in number, and are marked by a high level of conscientious scholarship. The first essay, by Canon A. J. Mason, deals with "Conceptions of the Church in early times;" the second, by Dean Armitage Robinson, treats "The Christian Ministry in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic periods;" the third, by Dr. C. H. Turner, is entitled "Apostolic Succession;" the fourth, by Archbishop Bernard, investigates "The Cyprianic Doctrine of the Ministry;" the fifth, by Dr. Frere, deals with "Early Forms of Ordination;" the sixth, by Dr. Brightman, collects much information bearing on "Terms of Communion and the Ministration of the Sacraments in early times."

The volume owes its origin to a public appeal by Canon J. M. Wilson for a fresh examination of the questions which gather round the origin and early development of episcopacy, and the nature and the degree of the sanction which it possesses. This appeal attracted the notice of the Primate, who wrote and suggested that a response should be made to it. Although the writers bring great learning and industry to their task they contribute, as they themselves are the first to confess, exceedingly little new knowledge to the vital positions of their subject. In the main they confirm Bishop Lightfoot's view of the origin of the episcopate. The Bishop wrote in his essay on the Christian Ministry:—

[1] *Essays on the Early History of the Church and Ministry*, by various writers, edited by H. B. Swete, D.D. Macmillans, 12/- net.

"It is clear then that at the close of the Apostolic age, the two lower orders of the threefold ministry were firmly and widely established; but traces of the third and highest order, the episcopate properly so called, are few and indistinct" (*Philippians*, p. 195).

"The threefold ministry can be traced to Apostolic direction; and short of an express statement we can possess no better assurance of a Divine appointment or at least a Divine sanction. If the facts do not allow us to un-Church other Christian communities differently organized, they may at least justify our jealous adhesion to a polity derived from this source" (*op. cit.* 267).

The discovery of the *Didache* after the publication of Lightfoot's essay gave support to the theory that the primitive Church possessed two types of ministry, one itinerant, the other local. The itinerant ministry consisted of apostles or missionaries, prophets or seers, evangelists or catechists. To these men fell the great work of the Gentile mission: they planted and organized churches, and visited them with sedulous care in order to stimulate and inform their members. This missionary ministry was held in high honour in the primitive Christian communities, and if its members chose, after a life of toil and danger, to settle in some local church, their presence was welcome, and their ministrations highly esteemed. The local ministry consisted of presbyters and deacons: these ministered the word, the sacraments, and poor relief in the local church. Speaking generally the members of the itinerant ministry were elected on account of their extraordinary spiritual gifts; the local ministry on account of their moral character. As missionary fervour died down and enthusiasm cooled, the itinerant ministry gradually lost its prestige, and the local ministry steadily grew in authority, especially when late in the first century it began to develop a third or episcopal order.

This theory of a dual ministry in the primitive Church, Dean Robinson and some of his fellow essayists appear to regard as discredited, although we are unable to see that they produce any conclusive evidence in support of their contention. It is quite possible that the contrast between the two ministries has been over-stated. For instance, we agree with them that to regard the local ministry as non-charismatic is alien to the thought and feeling of the Apostolic Church. In the primitive charismatic Church a *charisma* was as necessary for the proper distribution of poor relief as for prophetic teaching. Moreover, it is probable that there was in a number of cases no clear distinction between the members of the itinerant and the local ministries. An individual might belong to both ministries. Polycarp was both a bishop and a prophet. Philip, one of the seven, appears to have alternated the functions of a local deacon with those of an itinerant evangelist. The view, however, that there were two types of ministries in the primitive Church, an itinerant ministry and a local ministry, and that the itinerant was the more gifted and honourable, and that the monarchical episcopate was ultimately developed from the local ministry, seems to us to stand firm. The view moreover that it was the call of the Spirit, and the prayers, and benedictions, and laying on of hands of his fellow-prophets rather than an

indispensable ordination by the Twelve, or by a member of the episcopal order, that constituted a man a member of this itinerant ministry seems highly probable. The view that the members of this itinerant ministry were able to ordain or appoint a local ministry, to consecrate the Eucharist, and perform any or all of those functions now reserved by canon to the episcopate seems also highly probable. It is quite true that the evidence that can be adduced in support of these views is not great, but it is highly suggestive, and considering how little direct evidence we have altogether in the sphere of early Christian origins, it is as much as we have a right to expect.

At any rate, it is very hard to account for some of the facts as we know them, without some such theory of a dual ministry. There may be over-statement and over-emphasis in some of the conclusions arrived at by Harnack and Hort and others, who share their views in this matter, but their general contention seems to us to be still the best way of explaining the facts.

We must now glance briefly at some other points raised by the essayists. The concluding verdict of Canon Mason's essay is open to criticism:—

> "However far back the history is traced, no date can be assigned, however roughly, for the appearance of Catholicism in the Church, the Church was Catholic from the outset."

To-day we regard the monarchical episcopate, the Nicene theology, and a good many other things, as Catholic. Research seems to shew that they were developments, and did not exist in the early Church of Jerusalem. If the Church can be Catholic without these developments, this is an interesting conclusion at which to have arrived, and one to which Liberal Churchmen will take no exception, but we do not think this is what Canon Mason means. The word Catholic is first applied to the Church by Ignatius (c. 115 A.D.) in the sense of universal as opposed to local, the secondary meaning of Catholic, viz., orthodox, as opposed to heretical, is considerably later. Of course we may call Catholic the Adoptionist Christology of St. Peter's speeches in Acts i.—xii., but if we do so we are giving the word Catholic a new sense. We may call the Church organization Catholic which existed in Antioch in the days of Symeon Niger and Lucius of Cyrene (Acts xiii. 1-3), but if we do so we are calling Catholic what no ordinary Catholic would consent to-day to call by that name. It is possible to-day to be too Catholic in the use of that popular term.

Dr. C. H. Turner, in what many will regard as the most valuable of the six essays, brings out clearly the influence which the Gnostic controversy had in developing the doctrine of Apostolic succession. The Catholic apologists had to appeal to apostolic tradition against their opponents, and this tradition they affirmed was preserved by the succession of bishops in the great apostolic sees. As the Gnostic controversy had much to do with settling the Canon of the New Testament and expanding the Baptismal Creed, so it established the Catholic episcopate. In every age the Church's vital needs have produced her development. In the early days of its existence, the episcopate was mainly viewed as preserving and guaranteeing the purity of the Church's teaching, and as a means of uniting the scattered Churches,

but not as securing the validity of her sacraments. Hegesippus, rather than Irenaeus, appears to have been the first to emphasize Apostolic Succession for apologetic doctrinal purposes.

Dr. Turner deals interestingly with the problems of re-union as tackled by Athanasius, Ambrose, and Augustine. Their spirit was large and statesman-like in contrast to the rigorist spirit of Chrysostom and Lucifer. Ambrose, we are told, relaxed "the strict rules of ordination for the sake of the salvation of the nations" (p. 172). The Anglican view that the sacraments are valid because of Christ's institution and promise, even though they be ministered by evil or heretical or schismatical men, is shewn to be mainly due to St. Augustine.

Archbishop Bernard's careful study of Cyprian's conception of the ministry loses its freshness for those who know Archbishop Benson's work. Cyprian feared that if heretical baptism were regarded as valid, heretics would claim not only to be Churchmen, but to constitute a Church. When asked what he made of the text: "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them," he replied that heretics cannot be gathered in Christ's Name. But quite as serious a question is quoted by Dr. Bernard, which Cyprian was not called upon to answer, "Can we recognize heretical baptisms and refuse to recognize heretical eucharists?" (p. 262).

Dr. Frere in an essay, second only in interest to Dr. Turner's, emphasizes the value of the early Church Orders in a way which reminds English students of the debt they owe to Bishop John Wordsworth's *Ministry of Grace*, and his edition of *Bishop Sarapion's Prayer-Book*. A careful study of *The Canons of Hippolytus* in Achelis' edition will give the ordinary student more insight into the Christian Church of the early third century than any other book we know of. Dr. Frere deals with the testimony of two anonymous tracts: *Concerning Ordinations*, and *Concerning Spiritual Gifts*. His comparison of the early rites used in the consecration of bishops and the ordaining of presbyters suggests the identity of their functions at an earlier date.

Dr. Brightman's essay is equally interesting to the ecclesiologist. Whilst of necessity many of the facts cited are well-known to students, there are others which we believe will be quite fresh, *e.g.*, that Pope Stephen, like Pope Nicholas I., six centuries later, was willing to accept as valid, baptisms conferred in the Name of Jesus Christ (p. 346). The fact that the Church in the ante-Nicene period did not join persons together in Holy Matrimony but confirmed their marriage by invocation and benediction, is no doubt well known, but it has a bearing upon modern controversies, as has also the early Church's attitude towards forced concubinage.

How far this solid contribution to sound learning will help the cause of re-union, it is impossible to predict. Perhaps it will teach some the lesson Dr. Swete emphasizes in his admirable preface, that although to ignore the lessons of Church History is folly, yet

> "the fetish of primitiveness is scarcely less to be deprecated than the fetish of mediaevalism. . . Each age of the Church must live its own

life, and deal with its own problems, following to a great extent the lead of circumstances, which offer in fact a Divine guidance for the shaping of its course" (p. xvi.-xvii.).

H.D.A.M.

BOOKS FOR THE CAMBRIDGE CONFERENCE.

I have been asked to suggest a list of books dealing with the Psychology of Religious Experience, some of which might be read by those who propose to attend the Modern Churchmen's Conference at Cambridge in August.

It has seemed to me that instead of publishing a bare list it might be better to treat the literature of the subject from the standpoint of my own personal experience.

It was the *First Epistle of St. John*, and in a less degree the Gospel by the same writer, which attracted my attention to the subject. This was due especially to his striking use of the phrase "we know" represented by the two Greek words γινώσκομεν and οἴδαμεν (v. 20) denoting respectively the knowledge of religious experience and the knowledge of intellectual conviction. Shortly after that I read Dean Inge's *Christian Mysticism* (Methuen, 1899), which threw much light on this knowledge of religious experience and seemed to give added significance to various passages in John Bunyan's *Grace Abounding*, St. Augustine's *Confessions*, and Pascal's *Les Pensées*, which I had already read. The next book on the subject which stands out in my mind was Prof. William James' *Varieties of Religious Experience* (Longmans, 1902). I had already been attracted to him by his essay *The Will to Believe* (Longmans, 1897) which seemed to me at the time to be the best modern defence of faith that I had come across. To-day it is the fashion to speak somewhat contemptuously of William James' writings, but this contempt is only directed against his philosophy of Pragmatism which roused the natural indignation of absolutist philosophers. Probably all would acknowledge that he stands very high as a psychologist, and his *Varieties* comes under the head of psychology. Personally I can think of no more illuminating and readable book to put into the hands of a layman. "He was the psychologist who wrote novels," in contrast to his brother Henry "the novelist who wrote psychology." W. James naturally led me to read Starbuck's *Psychology of Religion* (Walter Scott, 1899), which I regard as the best book with which to begin the scientific study of the subject. About this time I read Auguste

Sabatier's *Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion based on Psychology and History* (1902). This is a most lucid and instructive volume, and supplements James and Starbuck on the historical side. This was followed by Mrs. Humphry Ward's translation of Amiel's *Journal Intime*. These books formed my literary introduction to the study of religious psychology, and I venture to think that every one of them is worth reading.

Of recent years, books on our subject have poured forth from the press. Of these I should wish to name first, two delightful volumes which will be of special interest, as their authors are reading papers at the Conference, *The Soul of a Christian* (Methuen, 1900), by Prof. F. Granger, and *Adventures of the Christian Soul* (Camb. Univ. Press, 1916), by Mr. J. K. Saunders. There are two little books, very simple and suitable for those who are not students: E. S. Waterhouse's *Psychology of the Christian Life* (C. H. Kelly, 1903), and Bishop Boyd Carpenter's *The Witness of Religious Experience* (Williams & Norgate, 1916). Another volume for the same class of reader, but written in a different style, and from quite another point of view, is Alfrida Tillyard's *The Making of a Mystic* (Heffer, 1917). Mrs. Constantine Graham, the writer of it, will be reading a paper at the Conference. Another lady member of the Conference who has written on a kindred theme is Miss L. Swetenham. Her book, *Religious Genius*, now in its second edition, was published in 1907 (Hodder & Stoughton).

Two books by American writers, Dr. G. A. Coe's *The Religion of a Mature Mind* (Fleming H. Revell, 1902), and H. C. King's *The Seeming Unreality of the Spiritual Life* (Macmillan, 1908), have their contribution to make to two important aspects of the subject, as have also T. J. Hudson's *Psychic Phenomena* and *The Divine Pedigree of Man*.

Two other books, also by Americans, but more extended in range and technical in treatment, viz., Professor G. M. Stratton's *Physchology of the Religious Life* (G. Allen & Unwin, 1911), and Prof. E. S. Ames' *Psychology of Religious Experience* (Houghton Mifflin, 1910), may be commended to students.

Two books which may well follow the last two mentioned are Galloway's *Principles of Religious Development* (Macmillan, 1909), and Dr. Harald Höffding's *Philosophy of Religion* (E. T. Macmillan, 1906). But the books dealing with various aspects of the subject are so numerous, that it is difficult to know where to draw the line.

The Psychology of Religion can hardly be studied satisfactorily without recourse to the study of the History of Religion and Comparative Religion on the one hand, and the general study of Psychology, animal as well as human, on the other, and those who get thus far will probably not stop short of attempting the Philosophy of Religion. These things all run into one another and elucidate each other.

But perhaps one ought to mention a few more popular books on the precise subject of the Cambridge Conference. One of the latest is by Horace J. Bridges, *The Religion of Experience* (Macmillan, 1916), and is addressed to "laymen and the unchurched." One of the cheapest in price is J. H. Leuba's *The Psychological Origin and the Nature of Religion* (Constable, 1909, 1/-); one of the most attractive so far as its title goes is Dr. D. A. Murray's *Christian Faith and the New Psychology* with the sub-title "Evolution and Recent Science as Aids to Faith" (Fleming H. Revell, 1911); one of the most practical is George Steven's *The Psychology of the Christian Soul* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1911); one of the most brilliant, and with it I conclude, is Dean Inge's *Faith and its Psychology* (Duckworth, 1909).

I hope that I have contributed enough to enable intending readers to make their selection. I should be very glad if students who know of useful books which I ought to have mentioned would kindly communicate with me in time to allow me to publish their titles in our next month's issue. H.D.A.M.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

The Council met at the Church House on Friday, April 5th.

The Treasurer's Report showed a balance in hand of some £200. The Secretary reported the addition of 36 new members since the last meeting, and the loss by death or resignation of fourteen.

Arrangements for the Annual Meeting were considered. The Chairman reported that Dr. Macan, the Master of University College, Oxford, and Mr. Anson, the Vicar of Birch-in-Rusholme, Manchester, had accepted invitations to speak at the public meeting. It was agreed that a draft restatement of the "Objects of the Churchmen's Union" should be submitted to the business meeting. This draft was adopted by the Council, with some amendments, and will be circulated before the annual meeting, in order that it may be well considered.

The Council made a special grant of £150 to meet the great increase in the cost of the publication of the *Modern Churchman*.

In view of the agitation about the marriage laws, the Council agreed to appoint a small committee to draft a report upon the various questions which arise. It is hoped that the report will be one which the Council can adopt and publish.

Manchester Branch.—On Thursday, March 21st, a public meeting held in the Milton Hall, Deansgate, was addressed by Miss Maude Royden, who spoke on "The God of the Ordinary Man."

In the absence of Sir Edward Russell, who had been prevented from attending, the chair was taken by the Rev. Francis Hutchinson, the President of the Branch.

Miss Royden addressed an audience of about 200 persons, and devoted her remarks to the examination of certain anachronisms of religious belief which seemed now only to exercise functions of obscure utility. Some ideas reflecting the mentality of the worshippers of a Tribal God, were asserted by her to be gravely damaging to the religious life of plain people. In fact, these notions had amongst the well-informed already suffered euthanasia, and were awaiting the decent burial which was, after all, their due. What the ordinary man or woman needed in these times of stress was, not the Oriental despot type of Deity, but something widely different—something attractive to the highest instincts and purest emotions. A vote of thanks was proposed by the Rev. Harold Anson (a visitor) seconded by Mr. T. C. Horsfall.

Yorkshire Branch.—A public meeting of this branch was held on March 22nd in the Church Institute at Leeds, when the Rev. Alfred Fawkes, the author of *Studies in Modernism*, read an interesting paper entitled "First English, then Anglican," dealing with the character and function of the National Church. The paper and questions which arose out of it produced a prolonged discussion. Mr. P. H. Bagenal, O.B.E., presided at the meeting, and spoke hopefully of the prospects of religion in the nation.

Bristol Branch.—On May 7th a meeting of the branch was held at the West of England Academy, Clifton, when the President, the Rev. J. Gamble, read a paper on "The Prospects of Religious Revival."

There was an encouraging attendance in spite of a very wet evening.

The lecturer first traced the history of four previous revival periods in the Church, viz., those of Luther, George Fox, John Wesley, and the Tractarian Movement, and then proceeded to deal with the needs and demands of the present critical time.

Some discussion followed, in which the Rev. Hubert Handley (of London), and Miss Alice Gardner took part.

The chair was taken by the Rev. J. M. Jeakes, who gave an introductory address on the aims and purposes of the Churchmen's Union.

CORRESPONDENCE.

WOMEN SOCIAL WORKERS AND THE CLERGY.

SIR, *To the Editor of the* MODERN CHURCHMAN.

I have been much interested in Canon Glazebrook's article in the current *Modern Churchman* upon Women and the Church, especially in what he says of social work, and of the attitude of the Church towards it.

As a social worker both for Infant Welfare and for Women's Institutes, I am forcibly and disagreeably struck by the way in which—(*as a general rule*)—the clergy hold aloof from, or even oppose these two excellent movements. To this "aloofness" there are naturally honourable exceptions, but the attitude is too often one of standing aside or of disapproval.

Why should this be? And is it not a grave mistake?

Do the clergy adopt this strange attitude because Women's Institutes and Infant Welfare work are undenominational? or because they are chiefly worked by women?

Even though Women's Institutes include all sects and classes amongst their members, does not this make for that unity which the clergy declare with their lips is so advisable? Yet village after village can tell how the Rector takes no interest in the Institute, or actually dislikes it.

Are the clergy too narrow and conservative to help and encourage progress on the democratic and uplifting lines so much encouraged by the Board of Agriculture in Women's Institutes?

Or does there still lurk in the minds of our clergy the old, primitive fear and distrust of the ecclesiastic for women?

Infant Welfare work is distinctly for the good of the race, and for the individual mothers and babes helped by it. Yet here again the clergy—as a body—take small part in what is now a great national movement. Does it never occur to them what a powerful weapon it might be in their hands, seeing that it deals with *mothers* both before and after the birth of their children, and with children from the earliest moment of life. To teach character training is part of Infant Welfare work. Do the clergy realise this?

The lay-social workers often feel that the clergy are hampering instead of helping them; and those of us who are Church people as well as social workers cannot but say, from our hearts, "The pity of it."

44, *Finchley Road, N.W.* 8, L. G. MOBERLEY.
April 21, 1918.

AN ILLIBERAL PROPOSAL.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

It is somewhat startling to find in Mr. Walker's article "Labour and the Church" a suggestion that the State should "disallow within the Established Church the particular ecclesiastical dogma" of Apostolic Succession, that "the laity in Parliament" should "cut it out as by a surgeon's knife."

Many Liberal Churchmen will share his dislike of this doctrine as at present applied and interpreted, as well as his belief in the value of an Established Church, but they will also feel that this particular proposal runs clean counter both to a right conception of the relations between Church and State, and also to the fundamental principles of liberalism. We may meet a doctrine by argument, or try to prevent the Church basing its policy on a theory held only by a section of its members, but we may not attempt by coercive measures to prohibit the holding of such a doctrine or theory. We exist in order to protest against such methods.

C. W. EMMET.

West Hendred Vicarage,
April 24, 1918.

CRUCIFIXES AT SALISBURY.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

In fairness to the newspaper which Canon Dimont criticises in your April issue, I must, as its editor, ask space for a reply.

Your correspondent has not yet seen fit to send a word of criticism to the paper itself, where of course, his points (if any) would have been faithfully dealt with. Presuming on your readers' ignorance of local conditions he asks them to believe that he, an ecclesiastical dignitary, is a better judge of local lay opinion on recent ritualistic innovations than the lay editor of a local paper.

From the character of his letter I conclude that your correspondent cannot be a regular reader of the *Salisbury Times*. I submit, however, that he ought not to utilize his ignorance of it to delude your readers by making statements about it which he cannot possibly substantiate. He cannot produce any evidence for his insinuation that the article which he criticises was published to discourage co-operation between the Church and Nonconformists. There is none, for it is not the truth. Neither is the further insinuation that such discouragement is the settled policy and ambition of the paper. Its files will abundantly testify to many years of appeal for just that co-operation which is now reported to be in hand. It so appreciated the effort to which Canon Dimont refers that in order to give the movement a fair chance to survive its very long overdue birth it refrained from publishing a batch of criticisms dealing with the dedication of this particular crucifix which, by a coincidence, occurred at practically the same time, and had to be dealt with in the same issue of the paper. That forbearance seems to have been a mistake. It has apparently given the appearance of isolation to opinions in the article referred to, whereas, in fact, those opinions have been well supported by voice and pen. The mistake will not be repeated on the next occasion, and responsibility for any ensuing controversy which may arise must rest on these innovators, and not, as they audaciously assert after each of their "grand offensives," on those who protest against the innovations.

THE EDITOR OF THE "SALISBURY TIMES."

May 6, 1918.